

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 29-35 are pending. Claims 5, 7, 12-14, 18-19, 21-24 and 28 are canceled. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27 and 29-33 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments. For example, support for these amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0008] and [0009] of the above-identified patent application. Moreover, a number of clerical errors have been corrected herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The instant Office Action states that Claim 6 is objected to because of the placement of a semicolon between the words "network" and "comprising". Applicants respectfully point out that the aforementioned clerical error in Claim 6 has been fixed. In so much as this clerical error has been fixed, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 6 is moot.

Moreover, the instant Office Action states that Claim 32 is objected to because "Claim 32 is a duplicate of claim 30." Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 30, as amended, recites the features: "wherein the first session key comprises a symmetric key" (emphasis added). Claim 32, as amended, recites the features: "wherein the first session key comprises a symmetric session key" (emphasis added). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claims 30 and 32 be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The instant Office Action states that Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter at issue. In particular, the instant Office Action states that Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to various clerical errors therein. In so much as these clerical errors have been fixed herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaufman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,081,678; hereinafter "Kaufman") in view of Droge (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004898 A1). Applicants have reviewed the above-cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments as recited in Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 29-35 are patentable over Kaufman in view of Droge for at least the following rationale.

Independent Claim 1, and similarly independent Claims 6, 10 and 29, recites the features (emphasis added):

A method of transmitting secured data, the method comprising:
utilizing a first key to encrypt a payload;
adding a header to the encrypted payload to form a data packet;
utilizing a second key to encrypt the first key;
utilizing a third key to encrypt the data packet;
transmitting the encrypted first key to a wireline device, wherein the

wireline device decrypts the encrypted first key; and
transmitting the encrypted data packet over a wireless link to a gateway, wherein the gateway decrypts the encrypted data packet to recreate the encrypted payload and the header, and forwards the encrypted payload and the header to the wireline device over an open network; and
utilizing the wireline device and the first key to decrypt the encrypted payload.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaufman in view of Droge fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, and similarly Claims 6, 10 and 29. Applicants understand Kaufman to teach utilizing an encrypted key as a key identifier in a data packet in a computer network. Applicants understand Droge to teach a system and method for highly secure data communications. However, Applicants do not understand Kaufman in view of Droge to teach or suggest “utilizing a third key to encrypt the data packet”, as claimed (emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, and similarly Claims 6, 10 and 29, is not unpatentable over Kaufman in view of Droge under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As such, allowance of Claims 1, 6, 10 and 29 is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 2-4, 20, 25 and 26, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 2-4, 20, 25 and 26 depend from allowable independent Claim 1, and recite further features. With respect to Claims 8, 9 and 27, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 8, 9 and 27 depend from allowable independent Claim 6, and recite further features. With respect to Claims 11 and 15-17,

Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 11 and 15-17 depend from allowable independent Claim 10, and recite further features. With respect to Claims 30-35, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 30-35 depend from allowable independent Claim 29, and recite further features. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 30-35 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. As such, allowance of Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 30-35 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 29-35 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17, 20, 25-27 and 29-35 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: May 16, 2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 377-0500